

REMARKS

Claims 1, 19, and 20 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-20 remain pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Eichstaedt.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, Eichstaedt describes automatic generation of a user profile, based on monitoring and analyzing a user's access to hierarchical levels within a set of structured documents, and "pushing" webcast content to the user based on the profile so generated. Eichstaedt at col. 1, lines 34-63 and col. 3, lines 7-25. Eichstaedt teaches a way to learn from the choices a user makes in accessing hierarchical levels within a set of structured documents what the user's preferences and/or interests are, and then pushing content to that same user that the user's past choices indicate may be of interest to the user. By contrast, claim 1 as amended recites, "receiving in real time from a source other than the participant an indication that the item is of current interest" and "informing the participant that the item is of current interest". Therefore, claim 1 requires that the indication that the item is of current interest come from a source other than the participant who is informed that the item is of current interest, whereas Eichstaedt teaches learning from a user's own past actions what is of interest to that user. See, e.g., and without limitation, Application at p. 9, line 13 – p. 11, line 15; p. 13, lines 1-5; p. 24, lines 1-9; and Figure 1 (noting in particular the distinction between the alerting user 102 and the participant 104). As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Eichstaedt.

Claims 2-18 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 19 recites a system for practicing the method of claim 1 and has been amended in the same manner as claim 1. Therefore, claim 19 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 20 recites a computer program product for practicing the method of claim 1 and has been amended in the same manner as claim 1. Therefore, claim 20 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2592
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT AND YI, LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014